DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 277 097 EA 019 002

AUTHOR Allen, Charlie Joe
TITLE Data Sources for Administrators Attempting Local Reforms: A Preliminary Study of the Power Structure of a Selected Community in East Tennessee.
PUB DATE Nov 86
NOTE 23p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Southern Regional Council on Educational Administration (Atlanta, GA, November 9-11, 1986). Tables contain light, broken type.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Community Control; *Community Leaders; Community Study; Decision Making; Educational Change; Elementary Secondary Education; Interviews; Leadership Styles; Network Analysis; *Power Structure; Research Methodology; Research Needs; *Research Utilization; Role Theory; School Community Relationship; School Districts; *Social Theories
IDENTIFIERS *Tennessee

ABSTRACT

Using techniques of the reputational method to study community power structure, this report identifies components of power structure in a Tennessee school district, demonstrates that proven methodologies can facilitate educational leaders' reform efforts, and serves as a pilot study for further investigation. Researchers investigated the district in terms of 13 interest sectors, including business, education, women's groups, and minority groups. Thirty interviewees were chosen from the sectors by leadership position. Interviewees identified district issues, organizations influencing issues, and individuals influencing resolution of issues. Interview questions and tables of results appear in four appendices of this report. Researchers conducted a second round of interviews with 13 respondents, data from which are appended in six tables. Interviewees identified leaders, who were ranked according to degree of perceived social power. Two of the top five issues identified concerned education. Conclusions are: (1) Official position and power are closely related; (2) power of established, wealthy families is not apparent; (3) new leaders are emerging from new businesses; (4) media control provides for a power base; and (5) minority groups lack local power. Additional interviews can yield a more comprehensive description of community power structure; research in progress enhances this report's reputational methodology with techniques from network theory. (CJH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED277097

DATA SOURCES FOR ADMINISTRATORS ATTEMPTING LOCAL REFORMS:

A Preliminary Study of the Power Structure of A Selected Community in East Tennessee

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

****

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Charlie Joe Allen

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

A Paper Presented to
The Southern Regional Council on Educational Administration
At the Annual Meeting in Atlanta, Georgia

November, 1986

****

By:
Charlie Joe Allen
Director of Curriculum
Johnson City Public Schools
Currently in Graduate Residency at
East Tennessee State University

Under the Direction of:
Ralph Kimbrough
Visiting Professor
East Tennessee State University

EA 019 002

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

DATA SOURCES FOR ADMINISTRATORS ATTEMPTING LOCAL REFORMS: A Preliminary Study of the Power Structure of A Selected Community in East Tennessee

Introduction

A variety of data sources are needed when a school system is anticipating reform. Since many significant reform measures contemplated by school system officials must have the approval and support of the community leaders in order to succeed, understanding the power structure of the community is essential for school administrators. At the very least, school administrators need to know who the influential citizens are and to have a good idea of the relative power that each possesses.

Power, as used in this paper, refers to social power which Kaplan defines as "participation in the making of decisions". (Mott, 1970, p 5) Participation may be direct or indirect, overt or covert. Structure is the interrelation of parts as dominated by the general character of the whole. (Webster, 1960, p 841) Consequently, the power structure of a community refers to the interrelation of the influential citizens and organizations in the decision-making process with regard to the issues confronting the community. A knowledge of how these influentials interrelate in the decision-making

process is also highly desirable but difficult to discover.

The primary purposes of this study were to identify the components of the power structure in a selected school district, to demonstrate how proven methodologies can be used to collect data needed to facilitate educational leaders' reform efforts, and to serve as a pilot study for more in-depth investigations in selected communities in East Tennessee.

Procedure

The procedures followed in conducting this study may best be described in terms of three phases. The first phase was described as the background and planning. The second phase consisted of initial interviews and data analysis and the third phase involved conducting a second round of interviews and analyzing the results.

Phase I:

Dr. Ralph Kimbrough directed a group of six graduate students to competency in the reputational method. These six (John Thompson, Ellis Winkler, Bruce Ayers, Henry Williams, Henry Reynolds, and Charlie Joe Allen) reviewed Kimbrough's materials and were tutored and counseled by him. Dr. Kimbrough, a noted authority on the study of community power, shared materials that he and his colleagues had developed and field-tested in various sections of the country. (Kimbrough, 1968) The instruments and procedures used by Kimbrough and his fellow researchers

at the University of Florida were modified, under his direction, to make them suitable for this limited study of a selected school district. (See figure A in appendix)

The school district was investigated in terms of thirteen interest sectors. These were business, farming, law, education, government, health care, women's groups, labor, finance, minority groups, and religion. Initial representatives of these areas were chosen primarily by the positional method, e.g. business executives or chief executive officers for various groups.

Phase II:

Interviews were conducted with the representatives of the interest sectors identified. Each individual interviewed was asked three questions:

1. What are the current or recent past issues confronting this district?

2. What organizations in this district are influential with regard to local issues?

3. Who are the individuals that have influence with regard to the resolution of community issues?

The group conducted a total of thirty interviews. The data was tabulated and the results recorded in the form of frequency tables. (See Tables 1,2, and 3 in appendix)

Phase III:

Individuals who had a frequency of three or higher from the initial interviews were listed alphabetically on a form prepared for the second round of interviews. (See Table 3 in appendix) Although actual names were listed on the form, they have been replaced by code numbers in this report to protect the confidentiality of the respondents to the interview questions.

Thirteen persons on this list were interviewed. Lack of time prohibited interviewing all persons on the list. During this second round of interviews, each person was asked to respond to six questions. (See figure B in appendix)

The data was tabulated and various descriptive indices were calculated. (See tables 4,5,6,7,8, and 9 in appendix)

Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendations

An analysis of the data enabled the researchers to identify the most significant current community issues and the most influential organizations in the community. A list of leaders was identified and rank-ordered according to the degree of perceived social power. The data revealed some of the characteristics of the leaders and some of the interrelationships among them.

Of the top five significant issues identified, two were directly related to education. This finding indicates that education is important to the decision makers in the community. The fact than any educational issues ranked so

high might be somewhat surprising and leads one to speculate that the community surveyed might be somewhat unique in this respect.

The most influential organization was the Chamber of Commerce. It was mentioned more than twice as frequently as an influential organization than was any other organization. A couple of leading civic clubs were ranked second followed closely by the Boys Club and the Junior League. The high rank of the Boys Club is somewhat surprising and the reasons for its position are unclear. Also the low rank of the Country Club was not expected. One must keep in mind that this was a limited study and that a more indepth study would probably alter the rankings significantly.

Of the top ten influential citizens, five held elective or appointed positions in government. Of the other four, three were business leaders, one was a businessman and former mayor, and one was the owner of the local newspaper. No women or members of other minority groups were among the top ten; however, one woman and one black leader were among the top twenty. One educator was among the top ten. Although some members of old established families in the community were prominent on the list, none ranked in the top ten. Some conclusions that might be drawn from this analysis are:

(1) If the positional method of studying the community power structure had been used, there would be a fairly strong correlation between the top ranked influentials identified via that method and those identified in this survey. Official position and power do seem to be closely related in this community.

(2) The power of the old established, wealthy families was not apparent in this study.

(3) New leaders seemed to be emerging from relatively new businesses and industries in the community.

(4) Control of the media, especially the press, appears to provide a significant power base.

(5) Minority groups lack city-wide power.

Again the reader is cautioned that this was a very limited study. These conclusions should probably be viewed as good questions to be examined in a more indepth study.

This study demonstrates the techniques involved in using the reputational method to study the community power structure. However, it would certainly not be characterized as a complete or in-depth description. A more accurate description of the power structure could be obtained by interviewing all influentials on the list for the second round of interviews. Moreover, an attempt to refine the list of issues and organizations should have

been made in the second round of interviews. Various versions of the reputational method have been used since Floyd Hunter made the technique widely known as a result of his study of the Atlanta power structure. (Bonjean and Olson, 1970) The results of these studies have been generally accepted as reliable guides to understanding the power structue of a particular community.

The technological advances in recent years have enabled some researchers to apply the mathematical techniques of network theory to data gathered in studies of community power. (Knoke and Kuklinski, 1982, Laumann and Pappi, 1973) These techniques allow the researcher to examine the interrelationships in the power structure more extensively. The reputational method enhanced by techniques from network theory has the potential for yielding a more accurate and comprehensive description of the community power structure than has here-to-fore been possible. A second study using the base established by the study described in this report is currently in progress. An attempt will be made to enhance the methodology described in this report with cluster analysis and multidimensional scaling, techniques from network theory.

REFERENCES

Bonjean, C. M., and Olson, D. M. (1964). Community Leadership: Directions of Research. In Aiken, M. and Mott, P. (Eds). The Study of Community Power. (pp 203-215). New York:Random House

Kimbrough, R. (1968). The Relationship of Socioeconimic Factors, Educational Leadership Patterns, and Elements of Community Power Structure to Local School Fiscal Policy. Contract # 0E 5-10-146. Washington DC: US Dept. of Health, Education and Welfare.

Knoke, D. and Kuklinski, J. (1982). Network Analysis Series: Quantitative Applications in the Social Sciences. (Eds) J. Sullivan and R. Niemi. Beverly Hills Sage Publications.

Laumann, E. and Pappi, F. (1973). New Directions in the Study of Community Elites. In Leinhardt, S. (Ed) Social Networks: A Developing Paradigm. New York. Academic Press.

Mott, P. (1970). Power, authority, and influence. In Aiken, M. and Mott, P. (Eds). The Structure of Community Power. New York: Random-House.

TABLE 1

GROUP PROJECT: STUDY OF POWER STRUCTURE IN JC
GROUP MEMBERS: M. Reynolds, H. Williams, J. Thomoson, C. Winkler
B. Myers, J. Allen
DIRECTOR: Dr. R. Kimbrough
DATE: May 1986

SECTION I: CURRENT ISSUES IN JOHNSON CITY

Issue	FREQUENCY
Education: Middle School	14
Revenue: Taxes Needed to Replace Fed. Funds	13
Downtown Development/Renewal	11
Transportation: Highway System	11
Education: Medical School at ETSU	10
Education: University Involvement in JC	10
Education: Administration at ETSU	8
Education: Better Schools Program (CERA)	7
Transportation: Airport Facilities	7
Industrial/Business Development	6
Police Hiring/Promotion Practices	6
Government: Moving of Courthouse	4
Moral Issues	4
Cultural Arts: Programs and Facilities	3
Government: Communication with Citizens	3
Government: Long Range Planning	3
Government: Regional Cooperation	3
Integration & Related Issues	3
Annexation	2
Billboards	2
Government: Crooked Elections	2
Transportation: Bus System	2
Waste Disposal	2
Employment: Shift to Service Jobs from Indust.	1
Government: More Focus on Programs vs. Facilities	1
Government: Out-of-Town Hiring Practices	1
Quality of Life Improvement	1
Teenagers: Health & Substance Abuse Problems	1

TABLE 2

GROUP PROJECT: STUDY OF POWER STRUCTURE IN JC
GROUP MEMBERS: M. Reynolds, A. Williams, J. Thompson, E. Winkler, B. Ayers, J. Allen
DIRECTOR: Dr. R. Kimbrough
DATE: May 1986

SECTION III: INFLUENTIAL ORGANIZATIONS IN JOHNSON CITY

ORGANIZATION	FREQUENCY
Chamber of Commerce	19
Kiwanis Club	9
Rotary Club	9
Boys' Club	7
Junior League	7
Lions Club	6
Republican Party	5
Civitan	4
Industrial Development Commission	4
Optimist Club	4
Shriners	4
Board of Education	3
ETSU	3
Arts Council	2
City Commission	2
Democratic Party	2
JCEA	2
North JC Business Club	2
Religious Roundtable	2
Salvation Army	2
Altursa Club	1
American Medical Assn.	1
Board of Education	1
Country Club	1
DAR	1
Dawn of Hope	1
Economic Development Committee	1
Head Start Board	1
Junior Monday Club	1
Labor Council	1
Muncy Methodist Church	1
Pro-To Club	1
St. Mary's Church	1
Tipton Hayes Society	1
United Way	1
Vetrans Administration	1
Volunteer Johnson City	1

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE 3

GROUP PROJECT: STUDY OF POWER STRUCTURE IN JC
GROUP MEMBERS: H. Reynolds, H. Williams, J. Thompson, E. Winkler, B. Ayers, J. Allen
DIRECTOR: Dr. R. Kimbrough
DATE: May 1986

SECTION II: LEADERS IN JOHNSON CITY

NAME	CODE	OCCUPATION/POSITION	FREQUENCY
	1	City Manager	14
	2	Lawyer/Indust. Commission	12
	3	Newspaper/The Press	11
	4	Businessman/Politics	10
	5	Commissioner/Mayor/Lawyer	9
	6	Businessman/Construction	8
	7	Businessman/Former Mayor	6
	8	Businessman/TPI	6
	9	Education/Supt.	6
	10	Commissioner/Appraiser	6
	11	Education/Board/Util Dist.	6
	12	Education/ ETSU Pres.	5
	13	Finance/Banking	5
	14	State Representative	5
	15	Executive Dir./Chamber of Com.	4
	16	Businessman/Black Leader	4
	17	U.S. Representative	4
	18	Businessman/Politician	4
	19	Minister/Munsey Methodist	4
	20	Active in Women's Groups	3
	21	Minister/Baptist	3
	22	Businessman	3
	23	Businessman/TI	3
	24	Commissioner/Lawyer	3
	25	Black Leader	3
	26	Lawyer/Politics	3
	27	U.S. Senator	3
	28	Educator/Board/Businessman	2
	29	U.S. Senator	2
	30	County Clerk	2
	31	Commissioner/Businessman	2
	32	Businessman/Lumber	2
	33	Realtor/Former Mayor	2
	34	State Rep./Farm Owner	2
	35	Black Leader	2
	36	Minister/First Pres.	2
	37	Educator/Black Leader	2
	38	Black Leader	2
	39	Minister/First Christian	2
	40	Black Leader	2
	41	Newspaper/The Press	2
	42	Black Leader/Pastor	

44	Lawyer/Judge	1
45	Lawyer/Judge	1
46	Finance/Home Fed. S&L	1
47	Gas Co.	1
48	Businessman	1
49	Contact Ministries	1
50	Commissioner/Educator/ETSU	1
51	Education/Former Supt.	1
52	Active in Women's Groups	1
53	County Chairman	1
54	Unknown	1
55	Health Dept. Dir.	1
56	Active in Women's Groups	1
57	Education/Board Chm/Military	1
58	Farmer/Farm Machinery	1
59	Businesswoman/Realtor	1
60	Farmer	1
61	Girls Club Worker	1
62	Lawyer/Judge	1
63	Health Care: JCMC	1
64	Businesswoman/Arts Council	1
111	Dentist/Admiral US Navy R.	1
112	Businessman/Construction	1
113	New County Chairman	1
114	State Senator	1
115	Unknown	1
116	Unknown	1
117	Lawyer/Judge	1
118	Businessman	1
119	Sheriff	1
120	Juvenile Judge	1
121	Businessman	1
122	Black Leader/Funeral Dir.	1
123	Active in Women's Groups	1
124	Businessman	1
125	Health Care: North Side Hosp.	1
126	Businessman	1
127	Medicine	1
128	Businessman/Pet Dairy	1
129	Social Worker	1
130	Educator/Board/Women's Bus.	1
131	Businessman/Car Dealer	1

FIGURE B

LEADERSHIP SURVEY

In every city some people have more influence in city affairs than others. We would like the best judgement of people like yourself about the leadership you believe your fellow citizens are taking in city affairs.

We have talked to other persons in the city about leadership. They have given us a list of people whom they consider to be important on city-wide problems. We would like for you also to consider this list of names for us and respond to the following questions. Your response will be kept confidential.

1. How would you rate each person on the list according to the criteria listed? (Please indicate your rating by placing an X in the appropriate column opposite each name.)

2. Which of the persons on the list do you feel you could count on most for support if you were interested in putting across a city-wide project? (Circle the number before the name.) Why?

3. Which of the persons on the list would be likely to cause you the most trouble in putting across a city-wide project? (Check the number before the name.) Why?

4. Which of the persons listed have influence with state leaders through whom they can get things done for the city? (Place an asterisk beside the number before the names.)

5. Do you conider any of the persons on the list as your close friends? (Place an X beside the number before the name.)

6. Should any other name(s) be added to the list? (List name(s) below.

FIGURE C

SUMMARY OF RESULTS

May 1985

GROUP PROJECT: STUDY OF POWER STRUCTURE IN JC

GROUP MEMBERS: M. Reynolds, M. Williams, J. Thomson, E. Winkler, B. Ayers, J. Allen

DIRECTOR: Dr. K. Kimbrough

SUMMARY AND ANALYSIS FOR SECOND SET OF INTERVIEWS

Each of the following pages contains the same information sorted in a different matter to emphasize certain characteristics of the interview results. The numers at the top of the columns have the meanings indicated below.

(1) = Name of Leader (To protect the confidentiality of the participants the names have been replaced with code numbers in this report.)

(2) = Power Rating (The Power Rating is obtained by assigning the integers 5-2 respectively to the columns 2 - 5 on the interview instrument; adding the ratings for each person on the list, and dividing by the number of interviews. RE question #1 on interview instrument, attachment E)

(3) = Frequency of Helpfulness (This is the number of times the person was designated as being generally supportive or helpful in relation to passing city-wide projects. RE question #2 on interview instrument, Attachment E.)

(4) = Helpfulness Index (This is calculated by expressing the frequency of helpfulness as a percentage of the number of interviews. RE question #2 on interview instrument, attachment E)

(5) = Frequency of troublesomeness (This is the number of times the person was designated as being generally troublesome or against city-wide projects. RE question #3 on interview instrument.)

(6) = Troublesomeness Index (This is calculated by expressing the frequency of troublesomeness as a percentage of the number of interviews. RE question #3 on interview instrument, Attachment B)

(7) = Frequency of State Influence (This is the number of times the person was designated as having influence at the State level in regard to city-wide projects. RE question #4 on interview instrument, attachment B)

(8) = State Influence Index (This is calculated by expressing the frequency of State influence as a percentage of the number of interviews. Re question #4, Attachment B)

(9) = Frequency of Friendliness (This is the number of times the person was designated as a close friend of the person being interviewed. RE question #5 on interview instrument)

(10) = Friendliness Index (This is calculated by expressing the frequency of friendliness as a percentage of the number of interviews. RE question #5 on interview instrument.)

TABLE 4

Sorted Alphabetically (numerically) by Leader Name

GROUP PROJECT: STUDY OF POWER STRUCTURE IN JC
GROUP MEMBERS: H. Reynolds, H. Williams, J. Thompson
E. Winkler, B. Ayers, J. Allen
DIRECTOR: Dr. R. Kimbrough
DATE: May 1986

SECTION IV: REPORT OF SECOND SET OF INTERVIEWS WITH LEADERS IN JOHNSON CITY

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
1	4.2	4	31%	0	0%	3	23%	2	15%
2	2.3	1	8%	0	0%	0	0%	1	8%
3	1.7	1	8%	0	0%	0	0%	1	8%
4	5.9	8	62%	0	0%	8	62%	5	38%
5	3.2	4	31%	2	15%	0	0%	1	8%
6	2.9	0	0%	0	0%	1	8%	1	8%
7	2.5	1	8%	0	0%	0	0%	2	15%
8	3.8	4	31%	0	0%	3	23%	2	15%
9	4.3	3	23%	0	0%	6	46%	1	8%
10	5.1	6	46%	0	0%	5	38%	3	23%
11	3.9	0	0%	2	15%	2	15%	2	15%
12	1.9	2	15%	1	8%	0	0%	1	8%
13	4.7	5	38%	1	8%	2	15%	2	15%
14	4.4	3	23%	0	0%	0	0%	2	15%
15	5.4	4	31%	1	8%	7	54%	1	8%
16	4.5	4	31%	1	8%	3	23%	3	23%
17	4.4	3	23%	0	0%	6	46%	4	31%
18	2.3	3	23%	0	0%	1	8%	3	23%
19	4.3	4	31%	0	0%	4	31%	5	38%
20	3.5	4	31%	0	0%	0	0%	1	8%
21	4.6	6	46%	0	0%	1	8%	4	31%
22	4.2	3	23%	0	0%	7	54%	3	23%
23	4.7	5	38%	1	8%	2	15%	3	23%
24	3.6	0	0%	2	15%	0	0%	1	8%
25	3.3	4	31%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
26	4.9	4	31%	0	0%	4	31%	3	23%
27	5.2	4	31%	0	0%	6	46%	1	8%
28	5.3	7	54%	1	8%	4	31%	2	15%
29	1.7	1	8%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
30	3.3	1	8%	0	0%	3	23%	1	8%
31	4.3	2	15%	1	8%	7	54%	0	0%
32	3.8	2	15%	3	23%	4	31%	1	8%
33	3.2	3	23%	0	0%	1	8%	3	23%
34	3.8	5	38%	0	0%	2	15%	3	23%
35	3.3	3	23%	0	0%	1	8%	3	23%
36	3.3	1	8%	0	0%	2	15%	1	8%
37	2.9	1	8%	3	23%	0	0%	0	0%
38	4.1	3	23%	0	0%	4	31%	1	8%
39	4.6	1	8%	6	46%	1	8%	2	15%
40	4.3	4	31%	1	8%	5	38%	3	23%
41	5.2	5	38%	1	8%	8	62%	5	38%
42	2.8	0	0%	0	0%	1	8%	0	0%

TABLE 5

Sorted by Power Rating (Col. 2)

GROUP PROJECT: STUDY OF POWER STRUCTURE IN JC
GROUP MEMBERS: R. Reynolds, H. Williams, J. Thomason
E. Winkler, B. Ayers, J. Allen
DIRECTOR: Dr. R. Kimbrough
DATE: May 1986

SECTION IV: REPORT OF SECOND SET OF INTERVIEWS WI P
LEADERS IN JOHNSON CITY

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
4	5.9	8	62%	0	0%	8	62%	5	38%
15	5.4	4	31%	1	8%	7	54%	1	8%
28	5.3	7	54%	1	8%	4	31%	2	15%
41	5.2	5	38%	1	8%	6	46%	5	38%
27	5.2	4	31%	0	0%	6	46%	1	8%
10	5.1	6	46%	0	0%	5	38%	3	23%
26	4.9	4	31%	0	0%	4	31%	3	23%
13	4.7	5	38%	1	8%	2	15%	2	15%
23	4.7	5	38%	1	8%	2	15%	3	23%
21	4.6	6	46%	0	0%	1	8%	4	31%
39	4.6	1	8%	6	46%	1	8%	2	15%
9	4.5	3	23%	0	0%	6	46%	1	8%
16	4.5	4	31%	1	8%	3	23%	3	23%
19	4.5	4	31%	0	0%	4	31%	5	38%
40	4.5	4	31%	1	8%	5	38%	3	23%
14	4.4	3	23%	0	0%	8	0%	2	15%
17	4.4	3	23%	0	0%	6	46%	4	31%
31	4.3	2	15%	1	8%	7	54%	0	0%
22	4.2	3	23%	0	0%	7	54%	3	23%
1	4.2	4	31%	0	0%	3	23%	2	15%
38	4.1	3	23%	0	0%	4	31%	1	8%
11	3.9	0	0%	2	15%	2	15%	2	15%
8	3.8	4	31%	0	0%	3	23%	2	15%
34	3.8	5	38%	0	0%	2	15%	3	23%
32	3.8	2	15%	3	23%	4	31%	1	8%
24	3.6	0	0%	2	15%	0	0%	1	8%
33	3.5	3	23%	0	0%	1	8%	3	23%
20	3.5	4	31%	0	0%	0	0%	1	8%
25	3.5	4	31%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
30	3.3	1	8%	0	0%	3	23%	1	8%
36	3.3	1	8%	0	0%	2	15%	1	8%
5	3.2	4	31%	2	15%	0	0%	1	8%
35	3.2	3	23%	0	0%	1	8%	3	23%
6	2.9	0	0%	0	0%	1	8%	1	8%
37	2.9	1	8%	3	23%	0	0%	0	0%
42	2.8	0	0%	0	0%	1	8%	0	0%
7	2.5	1	8%	0	0%	0	0%	2	15%
18	2.3	3	23%	0	0%	1	8%	3	23%
2	2.3	1	8%	0	0%	0	0%	1	8%
12	1.9	2	15%	1	8%	0	0%	1	8%
29	1.7	1	8%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
3	1.7	1	8%	0	0%	0	0%	1	8%

TABLE 6

Sorted by Helpfulness Index (Col. 3)

GROUP PROJECT: STUDY OF POWER STRUCTURE IN JC
GROUP MEMBERS: M. Reynolds, M. Williams, J. Thompson
E. Winkler, B. Ayers, J. Allen
DIRECTOR: Dr. R. Kimbrough
DATE: May 1966

SECTION IV: REPORT OF SECOND SET OF INTERVIEWS WITH LEADERS IN JOHNSON CITY

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
4	5.9	8	62%	0	0%	8	62%	5	38%
28	5.3	7	54%	1	8%	4	31%	2	15%
10	5.1	6	46%	0	0%	3	38%	3	23%
21	4.6	6	46%	2	0%	1	8%	4	31%
41	5.2	5	38%	1	8%	8	62%	5	38%
34	3.8	5	38%	0	0%	2	15%	3	23%
25	4.7	5	38%	1	8%	2	15%	3	23%
13	4.7	5	38%	1	8%	2	15%	2	15%
1	4.2	4	31%	0	0%	3	23%	2	15%
40	4.5	4	31%	1	8%	5	38%	3	23%
15	5.4	4	31%	1	8%	7	54%	1	8%
35	3.5	4	31%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
8	3.8	4	31%	0	0%	3	23%	2	15%
16	4.5	4	31%	1	8%	3	23%	3	23%
27	5.2	4	31%	0	0%	6	46%	1	8%
5	3.2	4	31%	2	15%	0	0%	1	8%
19	4.5	4	31%	0	0%	4	31%	5	38%
26	4.9	4	31%	0	0%	4	31%	3	23%
20	3.5	4	31%	0	0%	0	0%	1	8%
22	4.2	3	23%	0	0%	7	54%	3	23%
9	4.5	3	23%	0	0%	6	46%	1	8%
38	4.1	3	23%	0	0%	4	31%	1	8%
18	2.3	3	23%	0	0%	1	8%	3	23%
17	4.4	3	23%	0	0%	6	46%	4	31%
33	3.2	3	23%	0	0%	1	8%	3	23%
14	4.4	3	23%	0	0%	0	0%	2	15%
35	3.5	3	23%	0	0%	1	8%	3	23%
32	3.8	2	15%	3	23%	4	31%	1	8%
31	4.3	2	15%	1	8%	7	54%	0	0%
12	1.9	2	15%	1	8%	0	0%	1	8%
29	1.7	1	8%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
30	3.3	1	8%	0	0%	3	23%	1	8%
2	2.3	1	8%	0	0%	0	0%	1	8%
7	2.5	1	8%	0	0%	0	0%	2	15%
3	1.7	1	8%	0	0%	0	0%	1	8%
36	3.3	1	8%	0	0%	2	15%	1	8%
37	2.9	1	8%	3	23%	0	0%	0	0%
39	4.6	1	8%	6	46%	1	8%	2	15%
11	3.9	0	0%	2	15%	2	15%	2	15%
42	2.8	0	0%	0	0%	1	8%	0	0%
6	2.9	0	0%	0	0%	1	8%	1	8%
24	3.6	0	0%	2	15%	0	0%	1	8%

TABLE 7

Sorted by Troublesomeness Index (Col. 5)

GROUP PROJECT: STUDY OF POWER STRUCTURE IN JC
GROUP MEMBERS: H. Reynolds, M. Williams, J. Thomason
E. Winkler, B. Ayers, J. Allen
DIRECTOR: Dr. R. Kimbrough
DATE: May 1986

SECTION IV: REPORT OF SECOND SET OF INTERVIEWS WITH LEADERS IN JOHNSON CITY

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
39	4.6	1	8%	6	46%	1	8%	2	15%
37	2.9	1	8%	3	23%	0	0%	0	0%
32	3.8	2	15%	3	23%	4	31%	1	8%
11	3.9	0	0%	2	15%	2	15%	2	15%
5	3.2	4	31%	2	15%	0	0%	1	8%
24	3.6	0	0%	2	15%	0	0%	1	8%
40	4.5	4	31%	1	8%	5	38%	3	23%
12	1.9	2	15%	1	8%	0	0%	1	8%
31	4.3	2	15%	1	8%	7	54%	0	0%
23	4.7	5	38%	1	8%	2	15%	3	23%
16	4.5	4	31%	1	8%	3	23%	3	23%
15	5.4	4	31%	1	8%	7	54%	1	8%
28	5.3	7	54%	1	8%	4	31%	2	15%
13	4.7	5	38%	1	8%	2	15%	2	15%
41	5.2	5	38%	1	8%	8	62%	5	38%
38	4.1	3	23%	0	0%	4	31%	1	8%
25	3.5	4	31%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
19	4.5	4	31%	0	0%	4	31%	5	38%
29	1.7	1	8%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
20	3.5	4	31%	0	0%	0	0%	1	8%
30	3.3	1	8%	0	0%	3	23%	1	8%
9	4.5	3	23%	0	0%	6	46%	1	8%
2	2.3	1	8%	0	0%	0	0%	1	8%
18	2.3	3	23%	0	0%	1	8%	3	23%
7	2.5	1	8%	0	0%	0	0%	2	15%
33	3.2	3	23%	0	0%	1	8%	3	23%
3	1.7	1	8%	0	0%	0	0%	1	8%
35	3.5	3	23%	0	0%	1	8%	3	23%
36	3.3	1	8%	0	0%	2	15%	1	8%
8	3.8	4	31%	0	0%	3	23%	2	15%
1	4.2	4	31%	0	0%	3	23%	2	15%
22	4.2	3	23%	0	0%	7	54%	3	23%
34	3.8	5	38%	0	0%	2	15%	3	23%
17	4.4	3	23%	0	0%	6	46%	4	31%
21	4.6	6	46%	0	0%	1	8%	4	31%
27	5.2	4	31%	0	0%	6	46%	1	8%
42	2.8	0	0%	0	0%	1	8%	0	0%
4	5.9	8	62%	0	0%	8	62%	5	38%
26	4.9	4	31%	0	0%	4	31%	3	23%
14	4.4	3	23%	0	0%	0	0%	2	15%
6	2.9	0	0%	0	0%	1	8%	1	8%
10	5.1	6	46%	0	0%	5	38%	3	23%

TABLE 8

Sorted by State Influence Index (Col. 7)

GROUP PROJECT: STUDY OF POWER STRUCTURE IN JC
GROUP MEMBERS: R. Reynolds, R. Williams, J. Thomoson
S. Winkler, B. Ayers, J. Allen
DIRECTOR: Dr. R. Kimbrough
DATE: May 1986

SECTION IV: REPORT OF SECOND SET OF INTERVIEWS WITH LEADERS IN JOHNSON CITY

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
41	5.2	5	38%	1	8%	8	62%	5	38%
4	5.9	8	62%	0	0%	8	62%	5	38%
31	4.3	2	15%	1	8%	7	54%	0	0%
22	4.2	3	23%	0	0%	7	54%	3	23%
15	5.4	4	31%	1	8%	7	54%	1	8%
9	4.5	3	23%	0	0%	6	46%	1	8%
17	4.4	3	23%	0	0%	6	46%	4	31%
27	5.2	4	31%	0	0%	6	46%	1	8%
10	5.1	6	46%	0	0%	5	38%	3	23%
40	4.5	4	31%	1	8%	5	38%	3	23%
38	4.1	3	23%	0	0%	4	31%	1	8%
26	4.9	4	31%	0	0%	4	31%	3	23%
28	5.3	7	54%	1	8%	4	31%	2	15%
32	3.8	2	15%	3	23%	4	31%	1	8%
19	4.5	4	31%	0	0%	4	31%	5	38%
16	4.5	4	31%	1	8%	3	23%	3	23%
8	3.8	4	31%	0	0%	3	23%	2	15%
30	3.3	1	8%	0	0%	3	23%	1	8%
1	4.2	4	31%	0	0%	3	23%	2	15%
23	4.7	5	38%	1	8%	2	15%	3	23%
13	4.7	5	38%	1	8%	2	15%	2	15%
36	3.3	1	8%	0	0%	2	15%	1	8%
11	3.9	0	0%	2	15%	2	15%	2	15%
34	3.8	5	38%	0	0%	2	15%	3	23%
21	4.6	6	46%	0	0%	1	8%	4	31%
39	4.6	1	8%	6	46%	1	8%	2	15%
42	2.8	0	0%	0	0%	1	8%	0	0%
18	2.3	3	23%	0	0%	1	8%	3	23%
33	3.2	3	23%	0	0%	1	8%	3	23%
35	3.5	3	23%	0	0%	1	8%	3	23%
6	2.9	0	0%	0	0%	1	8%	1	8%
7	2.5	1	8%	0	0%	0	0%	2	15%
37	2.9	1	8%	3	23%	0	0%	0	0%
3	1.7	1	8%	0	0%	0	0%	1	8%
5	3.2	4	31%	2	15%	0	0%	1	8%
20	3.5	4	31%	0	0%	0	0%	1	8%
14	4.4	3	23%	0	0%	0	0%	2	15%
25	3.5	4	31%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
29	1.7	1	8%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
2	2.3	1	8%	0	0%	0	0%	1	8%
24	3.6	0	0%	2	15%	0	0%	1	8%
12	1.9	2	15%	1	8%	0	0%	1	8%

TABLE 9

Sorted by Friendliness Index (Col. 5)

GROUP PROJECT: STUDY OF POWER STRUCTURE IN JC
GROUP MEMBERS: M. Reynolds, M. Williams, J. Thompson
E. Winkler, B. Ayers, J. Allen
DIRECTOR: Dr. R. Kimbrough
DATE: May 1986

SECTION IV: REPORT OF SECOND SET OF INTERVIEWS WITH LEADERS IN JOHNSON CITY

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
19	4.3	4	31%	0	0%	4	31%	5	38%
4	3.9	8	62%	0	0%	5	62%	5	38%
41	3.2	5	38%	1	8%	8	62%	5	38%
17	4.4	3	23%	0	0%	6	46%	4	31%
21	4.6	6	46%	0	0%	1	8%	4	31%
10	3.1	6	46%	0	0%	5	38%	3	23%
26	4.9	4	31%	0	0%	4	31%	3	23%
33	3.5	3	23%	0	0%	1	8%	3	23%
34	3.8	5	38%	0	0%	2	15%	3	23%
16	4.5	4	31%	1	8%	3	23%	3	23%
23	4.7	5	38%	1	8%	2	15%	3	23%
18	2.3	3	23%	0	0%	1	8%	3	23%
40	4.5	4	31%	1	8%	5	38%	3	23%
33	3.2	3	23%	0	0%	1	8%	3	23%
22	4.2	3	23%	0	0%	7	54%	3	23%
28	5.3	7	54%	1	8%	4	31%	2	15%
15	4.7	5	38%	1	8%	2	15%	2	15%
8	3.8	4	31%	0	0%	3	23%	2	15%
14	4.4	3	23%	0	0%	0	0%	2	15%
1	4.2	4	31%	0	0%	3	23%	2	15%
39	4.6	1	8%	6	46%	1	8%	2	15%
7	2.5	1	8%	0	0%	0	0%	2	15%
11	3.9	0	0%	2	15%	2	15%	2	15%
36	3.3	1	8%	0	0%	2	15%	1	8%
3	1.7	1	8%	0	0%	0	0%	1	8%
30	3.3	1	8%	0	0%	3	23%	1	8%
5	3.2	4	31%	2	15%	0	0%	1	8%
12	1.9	2	15%	1	8%	0	0%	1	8%
32	3.8	2	15%	3	23%	4	31%	1	8%
27	5.2	4	31%	0	0%	6	46%	1	8%
38	4.1	3	23%	0	0%	4	31%	1	8%
6	2.9	0	0%	0	0%	1	8%	1	8%
20	3.5	4	31%	0	0%	0	0%	1	8%
2	2.3	1	8%	0	0%	0	0%	1	8%
13	5.4	4	31%	1	8%	7	54%	1	8%
9	4.5	3	23%	0	0%	6	46%	1	8%
24	3.6	0	0%	2	15%	0	0%	1	8%
42	2.8	0	0%	0	0%	1	8%	0	0%
29	1.7	1	8%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
25	3.5	4	31%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
31	4.3	2	15%	1	8%	7	54%	0	0%
37	2.9	1	8%	3	23%	0	0%	0	0%